



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/038,004	01/02/2002	Daniel R. Baum	Shutterfly 04C001	Shutterfly 04C001 8059	
31688	7590 08/10/2004		EXAMINER		
TRAN & ASSOCIATES			GARG, YOGESH C		
6768 MEAD SAN JOSE,	OOW VISTA CT. CA 95135		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3625		
			DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004	DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/038,004	BAUM, DANIEL R.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Yogesh C Garg	3625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 12 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	ne Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•				
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		240				
		V 100				

Yogesh C. Garg Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3625 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the refrence Lockhardt teaches uploading of images but points away from the element of receiving a single card order specifying a plurality of recipients and that single card order is completed in a single transaction sequence. The applicant is attacking the reference Lockhardt individually. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642. The same reasoning applies in not accepting the applicant's arguments against other references Shiota, Johnson, and Hartman. It is to be noted that these arguments were also presented in the Final Office action, pages 2-7, mailed on June 14, 2004.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Terminal Disclaimer received on July 12, 2004 is not acceptable because improper language was used and the person who signed the T.D. is not a recognized officer of the assignee (see Form Paragraphs 14.29 and possibly 14.29.02). Please encourage person resubmitting the TD to either use the forms from the MPEP Section 1490 or the language from the form re "pending second application.".